United Nations A/C.1/51/PV.23

General Assembly

Official Records

Fifty-first session

First Committee

23rd Meeting

Thursday, 14 November 1996, 3 p.m.

New York

Chairman: Mr. Sychou ..... (Belarus)

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Agenda items 60, 61 and 63-81 *(continued)*

Action on draft resolutions submitted on all disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairman: The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in clusters 6, 7 and 8.

The Committee will first take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.43, contained in cluster 6 on outer space (disarmament aspects).

I now call on the representative of the United States of America, who wishes to explain the vote of his delegation before the voting.

Mr. King (United States of America): The United States will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.43, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", for several reasons, the most important of which is the language in operative paragraph 6 which requests the Conference on Disarmament to re-establish the Ad Hoc Committee with a negotiating mandate to conclude an agreement or agreements to prevent an arms race in outer space.

This draft resolution once again suffers from a key conceptual weakness. It neglects the simple fact that there is no arms race in outer space. This success story can be directly attributed to the legal agreements already in existence. Those same agreements also serve to prevent a future arms race. Consequently, the negotiation of additional agreements is quite simply not required.

Accordingly, we do not agree either with the thirteenth and seventeenth preambular paragraphs or with operative paragraph 6 regarding the need to establish negotiations on the prevention of some hypothetical arms race in outer space. Therefore, we will call for separate paragraph votes and will vote "no" on the seventeenth preambular paragraph and on operative paragraph 6, since these paragraphs call for such negotiations.

Further, we cannot "regret" the inability of the Conference on Disarmament to re-establish the Ad Hoc Committee on the prevention of an arms race in outer space in 1996, as stated in the eleventh preambular paragraph. On the contrary, we believe that the Conference on Disarmament showed good judgement by not doing so.

Allow me to note with satisfaction the revised language in paragraph 8. If there is a need for such negotiations, the United States is certainly willing to keep the Conference on Disarmament informed, as appropriate. On the other hand, the recent revision to the thirteenth preambular paragraph, which frets about the weaponization of outer space, simply has no basis in reality.

An American astronaut recently set an outer space endurance record, and did so in a Russian spacecraft. Far from being in an incipient arms race, we are in an era of unprecedented cooperation in space. Thus, draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.43 remains mired in the cold-war past. Let us move on to real issues. There can be no benefit to negotiating hypothetical treaties to counter a non-existent threat.

96-86816 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.43. A recorded vote has been requested. Separate votes have been requested on the seventeenth preambular paragraph and on operative paragraph 6.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.43, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 16th meeting of the Committee, on 6 November 1996. In addition to the sponsors listed in the draft resolution and those which appear in document A/C.1/51/INF/3, it is also sponsored by India and Chile.

I would like to draw the attention of members of the Committee to the thirteenth preambular paragraph. The following phrase should be added to the end of that paragraph: "including the weaponization of outer space".

We shall now proceed to take action on the seventeenth preambular paragraph. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The seventeenth preambular paragraph was retained by 85 votes to 1, with 39 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Myanmar, Nigeria and the United Arab Emirates informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.43. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:
United States of America

Abstaining:
Andorra, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Paragraph 6 was retained by 87 votes to 1, with 39 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Myanmar, Nigeria and the United Arab Emirates informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolution as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:
Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:
None

Abstaining:
Andorra, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.43, as a whole, was adopted by 98 votes to none, with 40 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Nigeria informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery": draft resolutions A/C.1/51/L.1/Rev.1, L.5/Rev.1, L.8, L.10, L.25, L.26/Rev.1 and L.32. In this connection, I would like to inform members of the Committee that at the request of the sponsors, action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.11/Rev.1 has been deferred to a later stage.

I now call on those delegations wishing to make general statements on draft resolutions contained in cluster 7.

Mr. Purbo (Indonesia): I should like to comment briefly on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.10. The importance of regional conferences, seminars and workshops on disarmament and security, with the participation of officials, scholars, academics, journalists and research institutes, cannot be overemphasized. As the repository of experience and expertise on this issue for more than half a century, the United Nations can, upon the request of the countries concerned, render assistance for regional initiatives. The regional approach, in the view of my

delegation, has been effective. Our hope is that through such an approach negotiations can be focused on important priorities related to the strengthening of the security of the countries involved and to the reduction of armaments.

In this context, the importance of the continued operation and functioning of the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific in Kathmandu is self-evident. The Centre has given practical expression to the concept of a regional approach to disarmament, in both its nuclear and its conventional aspects. The Centre's primary task of assisting the States involved to deal with emerging issues of concern, stimulate new initiatives and explore fresh approaches to disarmament remains largely unfulfilled. My delegation therefore calls for the continuation of its activities.

Mr. Hussin (Malaysia): My delegation would like to take this opportunity to express its appreciation to the delegation of Mongolia and to the other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.10, "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific". My delegation is happy to join in sponsoring the draft resolution and hopes that the Committee will adopt it by consensus, as was the case with a similar text last year.

The existence of the Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament has contributed a great deal to fostering a climate of cooperation and disarmament, which enhances the process of confidence-building in our region. Following the changes in the international environment after the end of the cold war, the existence of the Centre has become more valid and relevant.

Malaysia is honoured to have been invited to participate in the regional dialogue promoted by the Regional Centre, which has come to be known as the Kathmandu Process. We hope that our active participation in this process has contributed to the aims and objectives of the Regional Centre. It is also our hope to see the Centre continue to carry out its activities with adequate support from the United Nations and from countries in Asia and the Pacific region.

In order to promote the expanded activities of the Regional Centre in Asia and the Pacific, Malaysia will continue to give its support to the work of the Centre, including exploring the possibility of hosting one of the Centre's activities in the near future. Our intention is to continue to contribute in our own small way to the process of disarmament and confidence-building in our region.

Mr. Guillén (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Committee is about to take action on draft resolutions in cluster 7, which contains a number of draft resolutions, including two on Regional Centres for Peace and Disarmament, one in Asia and the Pacific and one in Africa. My delegation welcomes those draft resolutions, with which we feel a special solidarity.

However, I would like to inform the Committee that this year Peru will not submit a draft resolution on the Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament headquartered in Lima, which has authority and jurisdiction over the entire Latin American region. This is because the Centre's future activities, which are temporarily suspended, will have to be carried out on the basis of voluntary contributions. I wish, nevertheless, to make it very clear that a Regional Centre of the same importance as those mentioned in the draft resolutions submitted by my colleagues has been reduced to a state of budgetary asphyxiation, particularly acute at the Lima Centre. Peru, for its part, will do its utmost to continue to pursue these activities.

I would also note that paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 50/71 C, which was adopted by consensus last year, requested consultations between the Secretary-General and the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); these were to be related precisely to the disarmament Centre in Lima. My delegation has requested information from the Secretariat on the action that has been taken on this matter, but we have not as yet received a reply. We would imagine that the workload has made such a response — though not the action — impossible. I would like to take this opportunity to repeat our request to the Secretariat.

We do not believe that regional disarmament activities can be carried out here from New York. We believe that it might be accurate to say that such regional activities are not the concern of New York. They are, however, of great importance for my country, which would like some concrete information. One of the teams of the Regional Centre in my country has been supported by voluntary contributions from a number of Committee members — Mexico, Spain, Sweden and some other countries — and I believe that these teams should not be transferred to any other body headquartered in Peru without the agreement of donor countries and, of course, of my Government. The Government of Peru will continue to strive to ensure that the Lima Centre continues to function and that it is able to perform its duties on a regular basis.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): We had requested additional time from the Secretariat for draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.1/Rev.1, "Expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament". I am now told that we have to make that request from the floor. I am therefore doing so now.

The Chairman: May I take it that the Committee agrees to postpone action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.1/Rev.1, as requested by the representative of the United States?

It was so decided.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.5/Rev.1, "Report of the Disarmament Commission". I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.5/Rev.1, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission" was introduced by the representative of Germany at the 16th meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November 1996. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in the draft resolution.

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the First Committee without a vote.

I call on the representative of Mexico on a point of order.

Mr. de Icaza (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I note that sub-paragraph (c) of paragraph 9 of document A/C.1/51/L.5/Rev.1 reads "to be added". Frankly, my delegation is unable to take a decision when it does not know to what that decision refers. What is involved here? Are we signing a blank cheque? I would suggest that this be deferred until such time as we know.

The Chairman: I would like to explain to the members of the Committee that we adopted a similar draft resolution last year, containing a similar paragraph. According to past practice, this text is to be added after the organizational session of the Disarmament Commission.

I call on the representative of Chile on a point of order.

Mr. Berguño (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I would like to suggest an alternative, just in case it should be useful. Instead of saying "to be added" in sub-paragraph (c), we could move the text of footnote 5 to the body of the draft resolution: that the Disarmament Commission will adopt a decision as to what the third item will be.

In any event, as the Chairman has indicated, this has been our past practice. Mine is just a suggestion for the format. My delegation will not press the point if this does not meet with the approval of the Committee.

The Chairman: This text was agreed upon in the course of consultations and I would urge members not to insist on any revisions.

We will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.5/Rev.1. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.5/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: I now call upon those delegations wishing to explain their positions.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): You know, Sir, our Mexican colleague had a very good point. I still regret that we did not pursue it further. My delegation decided to suppress our inclination to call for a recorded vote here and to allow the consensus to go forward because of special circumstances; but we would like to state that the United States has concerns about paragraph 9, to which Ambassador de Icaza directed our attention.

This is because, under the guise of a General Assembly resolution, this paragraph suggests that certain decisions have already been taken by the United Nations Disarmament Commission about its agenda. One tends to lose sight of the fact that this is a recommendation of the General Assembly.

And as the representative of Mexico points out, it is just splendid for the General Assembly to be recommending (a), (b), and "to be added". The United States has long been of the conviction that only the Disarmament Commission itself, and not the First Committee or the General Assembly, can make decisions related to the Disarmament Commission's programme of work, its agenda items, the number of agenda items, timing or anything else.

The United States, therefore, would have preferred a draft resolution that left the question of the future agenda to the Disarmament Commission's traditional organizational

session. In other words, our view may be like that of Mexico: that paragraph 9 is simply not needed. Nevertheless, the United States accepted this draft resolution because of the unusual circumstances surrounding the Disarmament Commission activity during this session of the First Committee. We would like to point out the unique nature of this draft resolution and of its paragraph 9, and wish to make it clear that, from our point of view, that paragraph and the draft resolution in its entirety do not set a precedent for the future.

I would like state firmly that the United States takes seriously the commitment expressed by the Chairman and other officers of the Disarmament Commission, that the third agenda item of the 1997 Disarmament Commission agenda, as the footnote in question suggests, will be an item on conventional weapons and be determined at a later date. We understand this item to be part of a package of topics, on which agreement to the parts is dependent on agreement to the whole. If it should turn out at the Disarmament Commission organizational session that there is any resiling on the commitment in this draft resolution that the third agenda item will be on conventional weapons, then as far as we are concerned the whole agenda question will be wide open again.

Mr. Rivasseau (France)(*interpretation from French*): France would like to associate itself with what the representative of the United States has just stated.

The Chairman: I call on the Chairman of the Disarmament Commission.

Mr. Hoffmann (Germany), (Chairman of the Disarmament Commission): I am, of course, relatively new to this disarmament business and therefore am no match for Ambassador Ledogar and his experience. However, during the years I have been here we have always proceeded in the manner the Disarmament Commission has proceeded this year. A final decision on the subject matter for the new item will be taken at the organizational session of the Disarmament Commission scheduled for December of this year.

There was general agreement in my consultations, in the presence of representatives of France and of the United States, that the third item would be an item on conventional weapons. However, we were simply not able to agree on a specific item that morning when we met here for informal consultations. These consultations will continue with the help of Indonesia, and I am confident that a positive decision can be taken as foreseen at the December organizational session.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.8.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.8, entitled "United Nations Disarmament Information Programme", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 14th meeting of the Committee, on 4 November 1996. The sponsors are listed in the draft resolution.

The Chairman: The sponsors have expressed the wish that draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.8 be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.8 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.10.

I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.10, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific," was introduced by the representative of Mongolia at the 15th meeting of the Committee, on 6 November 1996. In addition to the sponsors listed in the draft resolution, Australia has also become a sponsor.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.10 have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.10 was adopted.

The Chairman: We turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.25, "Report of the Conference on Disarmament". I call on the representative of India.

Ms. Ghose (India): I am sorry to have to ask to speak on the point I am about to make. I would have thought this would have been the job of the Secretariat.

Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.25 was not produced in a revised version for what were apparently financial reasons, even though I find that several revised draft resolutions have been published during this session. A very important correction was made to draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.25, and our decision on it depends on that particular change being read out at the time it is adopted. The change is set out in document A/C.1/51/INF/2, which the Secretariat circulated instead of a revised version. I think that the Secretariat should try to see that the task of delegations is eased, not complicated.

The Chairman: It is my understanding that the Secretary will indeed be reading out the revision to which the representative of India refers. The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.25. I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.25, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Poland at the 14th meeting of the Committee, on 4 November 1996.

It should be noted that the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution should be deleted, as is indicated in document A/C.1/51/INF/2.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.25 have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.25 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.26/Rev.1. I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.26/Rev.1, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa", was introduced by the representative of Togo, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States, at the 17th meeting of the Committee, on 7 November 1996.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.26/Rev.1 have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.26/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.32. I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.32, entitled "United Nations Disarmament Fellowship, Training and Advisory Services", was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 17th meeting of the Committee, on 7 November 1996. In addition to the sponsors listed in the draft resolution and in document A/C.1/51/INF/3, Australia has also become a sponsor.

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.32 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft texts contained in cluster 8, "Other disarmament measures": draft decision A/C.1/51/L.7 and draft resolutions A/C.1/51/L.12, L.13, L.14, L.20/Rev.1 and L.34.

I have been informed that the United States has requested that action on draft decision A/C.1/51/L.7 be postponed to a later stage. May I take it that the Committee agrees to that request?

It was so decided.

The Chairman: I now call on those delegations wishing to make general statements on draft resolutions contained in cluster 8.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): I would like to say in advance that when draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.12, on disarmament and development, comes up for consideration, the United States will not participate in the action. We will explain afterwards what our problem is.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.12.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.12, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development", was introduced by the representative of Colombia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Non-Aligned Movement, at the 14th meeting of the Committee, on 4 November 1996.

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.12 was adopted.

The Chairman: I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their positions on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.12.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): I request that the record of today's proceedings reflect that the United States did not participate in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.12. This draft resolution asserts a relationship between disarmament and development. The United States believes that disarmament and development are two distinct issues that simply do not lend themselves to being linked, and it was for that reason that the United States did not participate in the 1987 Conference referred to in this draft resolution.

We would like to take this opportunity to state that the United States does not and will not consider itself bound by the declarations in the Final Document of that Conference.

Mr. O'Rourke (Ireland): The States members of the European Union have joined in the consensus on the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/51/L.12, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development", and wish to clarify their understanding of it. While we recognize the considerable benefit that may accrue from disarmament, there is no simple, automatic link between, on the one hand, the European Union's commitments to economic and social development and development cooperation and, on the other hand, savings made in other areas, including disarmament.

At the same time, we would like to underscore the European Union's commitment to development cooperation and to note that assistance provided by the European Union and its member States to developing countries accounts for almost 40 per cent of the global total.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.13.

A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.13, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace", was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the 15th meeting of the Committee, on 6 November 1996.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.13 was adopted by 106 votes to 3, with 35 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Zambia informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of Andorra had intended to abstain.]

The Chairman: I now call on those representatives wishing to explain their votes after the voting.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): As has been the case with similar texts for the past several years, the United States was compelled again this year to vote against the draft resolution on the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. Like its predecessors, this draft resolution does not meet even the minimum requirements necessary to warrant our support. Once again, it fails to recognize the navigational rights and freedoms protected under customary international law as reflected in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. Freedom of overflight and the rights of innocent passage through territorial seas and of transit passage through international straits and archipelagic sea lanes must be explicitly acknowledged, in addition to freedom of navigation on the high seas. Absent such acknowledgement, the United States cannot and will not support any draft resolutions along the lines of this one.

Furthermore, we remain deeply concerned by the financial burden placed on the United Nations by the continued existence of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. In a budgetary environment marked by retrenchment across the board, there is simply no reason for the United Nations to continue to expend scarce resources on a committee whose work could be better done elsewhere. The United Nations cannot afford to support bodies that no longer serve any useful purpose whatsoever. Bluntly put, the Ad Hoc Committee's continued existence is a waste of money — money that could, and should, be put to much better use.

No one denies that issues of security and the peaceful resolution of disputes in the Indian Ocean region are important. The question is how best to address them effectively in a financially responsible manner. The work of the Ad Hoc Committee, such as it is, demonstrates conclusively that the current system is not the way. It is long past time that the States of the region recognized that financial responsibility means addressing issues of security in an appropriate regional forum, not in an obsolete and expensive Ad Hoc Committee.

As the United States noted last year, the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean is the only such group that meets under the auspices and budget of the United Nations. This should stop. The regional participants should endeavour to identify an appropriate regional forum to which their substantive discussions can be devolved. We hope that next year's draft resolution will be more effective than this year's in accomplishing this important task.

Ms. Hand (Australia): Australia is a littoral State of the Indian Ocean, and voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.13, on implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. At the same time, we are concerned that, despite a recommendation to do so at its 1993 and 1995 sessions, the Ad Hoc Committee has not been able to make concrete progress in agreeing to new alternative approaches to the zone of peace concept. We urge the Committee to make maximum productive use of its 1997 session with a view to recommending to the General Assembly a fresh approach to the development of mechanisms designed to enhance Indian Ocean regional security.

The Chairman: The Committee will proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.14. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the representative of Colombia on a point of order.

Mr. García (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I had understood that no request for a recorded vote had been made. I should therefore like to know, for information, which delegation requested a recorded vote.

The Chairman: I am informed by the Secretariat that the delegation of the United States of America requested a recorded vote on this draft resolution.

I call on the representative of the United States.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): Is this the new procedure to be followed in this Committee: when a recorded vote has been requested the Chairman will disclose who specifically requested it? I have no problem with that, but I should like to make use of such an procedure in the future. Is it the norm from now on that it is perfectly legitimate, whenever a recorded vote has been requested, to ask which delegation asked for it?

The Chairman: That is indeed the procedure. If the sponsors of a draft resolution make that request, we must disclose the information.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.14, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control", was introduced by the representative of Colombia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the 15th meeting of the Committee, on 6 November 1996.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jamaica, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey,

Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.14 was adopted by 116 votes to 4, with 26 abstentions.

The Chairman: I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes after the voting.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): I will let the other 29 members who apparently also wanted a recorded vote speak for themselves, but let me say on behalf of the United States that, although this draft resolution has been submitted once again, we still do not understand what its purpose is, or what the sponsors hope to achieve by its adoption. One thing that is clear, however, is that the potential effects of this draft resolution could divert us from the productive work in which Governments are already engaged in regional arms control and disarmament agreements and, instead, have us focus on drawing up vague environmental norms. For example, the draft resolution calls upon the States parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction to take into account

> "the necessity of ensuring the preservation of the environment". (*A/C.1/51/L.14, eleventh preambular para.*)

Any effort to introduce a new dimension into the ongoing negotiations on the Convention at this late hour is unhelpful and unwelcome.

It goes without saying that no one opposes the protection of the environment. Clearly, such concerns, when relevant, would appropriately be taken into account

in the implementation of arms control agreements. For its part, the United States has stringent environmental legislation that requires the preparation of environmental impact statements in a variety of situations, such as the removal of missiles from silos or the destruction of chemical weapons.

In our explanation of vote on the draft resolution on this same item last year, we noted that it selectively singled out certain arms control and disarmament agreements, whether completed or under negotiation, and that in doing so it took many of them out of context. Unfortunately, the laundry list of treaties in this year's draft resolution has grown substantially longer and is even more objectionable.

Moreover, the draft resolution is also apparently intended to function as a cookbook of sorts, because document A/C.1/51/L.14 now includes recipes for technology transfer and application, for sustainable development and for the peaceful use of outer space.

This confusion over purpose permeates the entire text. For example, draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.14 also states, in paragraph 1, that in the negotiation of arms control agreements, these agreements should ensure the strict observance of the relevant environmental norms. My delegation thought that the objective of our work here was to reach agreements on the control, reduction and/or elimination of arms, not to ensure compliance with environmental norms. In short, we strongly support efforts to protect the environment. We question, however, the purpose and utility of this draft resolution.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.20/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested. I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.20/Rev.1, entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament", was introduced by the representative of India at the 15th meeting of the Committee, on 6 November 1996. In addition to the sponsors contained in the draft resolution and those appearing in document A/C.1/51/INF/3, it has also been sponsored by Pakistan.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chile, Georgia, Japan, Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Marshall Islands, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Samoa, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Ukraine, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.20/Rev.1 was adopted by 81 votes to 39, with 22 abstentions.

The Chairman: I now call on the representative of China, who wishes to explain the vote of his delegation after the voting.

Mr. Sha Zukang (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.20/Rev.1, on the role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament. The Chinese delegation has always supported

such draft resolutions, for the following reasons: first, we support the promotion of international cooperation for the peaceful uses of science and technology so that they can accelerate the economic and social development of countries, particularly the developing countries. Secondly, export control regimes on dual-use goods and technologies should be set up with the universal participation of the international community.

At the same time, the Chinese delegation wishes to point out that we are concerned at the potential negative impact that the military application of science and technology can have on international peace and security. Of the three main categories of weapons of mass destruction, chemical and biological weapons have already been banned. Improving or upgrading these two categories of weapons through the military application of science and technology is illegal for countries that have signed the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction and the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction.

With the conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) relating to another category of weapons of mass destruction — nuclear weapons — improvement of these weapons too will be severely restricted. Upgrading this category of weapons is now almost impossible. This is one of the reasons why the conclusion of the CTBT was so important. China is not only concerned at the application of advanced science and technology to the development of weapons of mass destruction; we are equally, indeed more, concerned at the use of science and technology in the development of outer space weapons, and weapons systems such as the so-called theatre missile defence. In this sense the military application of science and technology is of equal importance to conventional weapons and to weapons of mass destruction. For this reason, we believe that the language in the second preambular paragraph of this draft resolution is clearly unbalanced.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.34.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting.

Ms. Ghose (India): We have just adopted a draft resolution which bears the same title as the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/51/L.34. However, the approach of the latter draft resolution is almost diametrically opposed to that of the one we have just adopted. While we welcome and appreciate the reference made in draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.34 to the need to enhance bilateral and multilateral dialogue on the role of science and technology in the fields of international security and disarmament, we continue to have reservations on the concepts set out in subparagraphs 1 (a) and 1 (b). We are of the view that the language contained in these paragraphs appears to promote and encourage ad hoc control regimes that are not only non-transparent and discriminatory but also exclusive. Our view on this issue is that, although control of dual-use technology transfers is necessary, these controls should be multilaterally negotiated, non-discriminatory and universally acceptable. Only then will these controls be effective and not amount to trade barriers — which is what they are today — thereby hampering the economic and social development of countries, in particular of developing countries. For these reasons, we are unable to support the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/51/L.34.

Mr. Dehghani (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation fully subscribes to the statement just made by the representative of India on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.34, entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields". Our delegation continues to maintain that the transfer of high technology should be regulated only through multilaterally negotiated, non-discriminatory legal instruments and treaties, not ad hoc regimes.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.34. A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.34, entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields", was introduced by the representative of Canada at the 15th meeting of the Committee, on 6 November 1996. In addition to the sponsors listed in the draft resolution, it is sponsored also by those that appear in document A/C.1/51/INF/3.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia,

Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Burkina Faso, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Gabon, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Namibia, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Uganda, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.34 was adopted by 137 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

The Chairman: I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes after the voting.

Sir Michael Weston (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.34, which the Committee has just adopted, on the role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields.

We abstained on the equivalent draft resolution last year for reasons which we had outlined in our explanation of vote in 1994. We remain committed to a cooperative approach to the issues raised by the role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament. We recall our disappointment that the international community was not able to agree on guidelines on this subject in the Disarmament Commission in 1994, despite the tireless efforts of Ambassador Mason of Canada. This was due to the refusal of an ever-dwindling number of delegations to recognize existing legal commitments already undertaken under relevant multilateral treaties and international agreements.

The draft resolution we have just adopted recognizes these commitments and urges all States to accept the responsibilities and commitments they have undertaken under such key treaties as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction and the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, all of which address the issue of the transfer of high technology related to weapons of mass destruction.

It is, of course, in full conformity with these legal obligations that a number of countries have put in place and are implementing proper export controls and safeguards against proliferation. The United Kingdom fully supports the principle of greater responsibility and transparency in the transfer of armaments and sensitive dual-use goods. We note that the Wassenaar Arrangement represents a valuable step forward in this area. Such arrangements are effective and transparent. They do not impede the transfer of high technology to the overwhelming majority of the international community. Only those countries with something to hide need fear export controls.

It was in that context that we were prepared to support draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.34, which should help enhance dialogue and cooperation. But, while we are ready to explore the possibilities offered by further dialogue, we are committed to the key principle recognized by all participants in the Wassenaar Arrangement, that decisions on the export of defence-related equipment are, and must remain, ultimately a matter for national Governments. Any follow-up to the ideas put forward by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.34 will need to reflect this reality.

Mr. Benítez (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Our vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/51/L.34 reflects, above all, my delegation's sincere willingness to contribute as much as it can to building the necessary consensus so as to ensure that in its future work this Committee may adopt a single draft resolution on this item, reflecting the interests of all delegations.

Given its limited scope, draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.34 is far from fully reflecting Cuba's position on an issue of such importance as that of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament. However, we take the view that the ideas contained in it may be useful in our work towards what, in our view, should be a priority objective on which we should all work together: to begin as soon as possible a multilateral negotiating process with the participation of all interested States, with a view to preparing non-discriminatory and universally accepted guidelines on the international transfer of dual-use and advanced technologies for military purposes.

Mr. Mesdoua (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): As with similar texts in previous years, my delegation again this year voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.34. We hope that the sponsors of these two draft resolutions, A/C.1/51/L.20/Rev.1 and A/C.1/51/L.34, will in future combine this initiative into a single draft.

The Chairman: We are moving along well. We have some time remaining, and I would like to propose that we proceed further by taking action on some of the draft resolutions contained in cluster 10. The draft resolution in cluster 9 awaits a report on its budgetary implications. That is why I propose taking action on cluster 10.

If I hear no objection, we shall proceed in the way I have outlined.

It was so decided.

The Chairman: I call on the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1.

Mr. Čalovski (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia): On behalf of the delegations of Albania, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Congo, Denmark, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation, Spain, Turkey, the United Kingdom, the United States, Zaire and my own delegation, I would like briefly to introduce the revised draft resolution entitled "The maintenance of international security — prevention of the violent disintegration of States" contained in document A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1.

In its new operative paragraph 4, draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1 affirms also the need for strict compliance with the principle of the territorial integrity of any State. All other paragraphs in draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1 are the same as in document A/C.1/51/L.42. Paragraphs 4 and 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42 thus become paragraphs 5 and 6 respectively in the revised text.

Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1 points to one of the basic thrusts of future United Nations activities on the maintenance of international security. Efforts to build a peaceful world, develop national and international cooperation and ensure progress for mankind and economic and social development will not be successful if preventive measures are not continuously taken to combat all forces of war, and all forces leading to the violent disintegration of States. In the coming period, preventive activities and preventive diplomacy, particularly in the field of international security in the disarmament process, will of necessity have a much higher priority than has been the case so far. What has been happening in the last several years, what is happening right now, and what could happen in the future provide more than sufficient grounds for the international community to continue to take preventive measures to combat all forces of destruction. That is the thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1.

The most important prerequisite for the work of the international community is that all States respect and promote all obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and international law in their relations with other States and in the field of international cooperation. So far, we have seen too many violent conflicts, too much human and material destruction. Let us try to prevent new conflicts of that nature from breaking out. Together we can do just that; this will be very important for the success of the disarmament process.

On behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1, I would like to express the hope that the draft resolution can be adopted without a vote.

Mr. de Icaza (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Mexico has studied with all due care the draft resolution submitted by the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in document A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1. We

understand the good intentions behind the draft resolution and the significant problem that it seeks to address. However, the draft resolution places itself in a global context within which references are made, *inter alia*, to certain regional organizations whose statutes do not provide them with jurisdiction in the areas in which they are being requested to take action.

Furthermore, it seems to us that the draft resolution is imbalanced from the legal standpoint, in that it stresses the principle of the territorial integrity of any State, but fails to take account of the principle of the self-determination of peoples. If the draft resolution were to be put to a vote, my delegation would abstain.

Mr. Sha Zukang (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): It is China's unswerving belief that all countries should abide by the Charter of the United Nations, the five principles of peaceful coexistence and other basic norms of international relations. Disputes and differences should be settled by peaceful means. The use or threat of use of force should be opposed, as should interference in the internal affairs of other States and infringement upon the sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity of other States. We understand the considerations behind the submission of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1. However, we cannot but point out that we oppose the disintegration of States by any means — whether violent or non-violent. Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1 mentions only the violent disintegration of States. This language does not cover the entire picture and is unhelpful. In addition, although we are in favour of developing friendly relations among nations and promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion, this is obviously the domain of other committees. The First Committee does not have the mandate or the expertise to discuss human rights issues. It would be inappropriate for us to introduce this issue, which is irrelevant to this Committee, onto our agenda. Therefore, we request a recorded vote on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1. The delegation of China will abstain in the vote.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): The delegation of Pakistan wishes to commend the delegation of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia for its efforts to try and develop a consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1. As a country which has been subjected to violent disintegration, Pakistan cannot but support the spirit and objectives of this draft resolution. However, there are a number of shortcomings in the text which have prevented us from extending such support to the draft resolution itself.

First, the principle of the territorial integrity of States has always been balanced by reference to the principle of the self-determination of peoples. My delegation would have been happy if the sponsors had been able to insert in this draft resolution a reaffirmation of that principle and a reference to the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, where the balance between the principle of territorial integrity and the principle of self-determination has been very carefully negotiated and agreed.

Secondly, we are somewhat concerned that the reference at the end of the fourth preambular paragraph to human rights and fundamental freedoms could be misconstrued by certain quarters in order to promote objectives which are in fact contrary to the stated objectives of this draft resolution and to promote interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States. We would have been happier if this reference had been excluded from the draft resolution, or formulated in a more concrete way so as to ensure that the provision could not be misinterpreted or misused in the future for the purpose of interfering in the internal affairs of States.

For these reasons, and despite our very strong sympathy with the objectives of this draft resolution, the delegation of Pakistan will be constrained to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1 if it is put to the vote.

Mr. Broadhead (New Zealand): I apologize for not speaking on this matter earlier. My delegation does not yet have final instructions on two of the items in cluster 10. The draft resolutions on which we do not have instructions are A/C.1/51/L.22, entitled "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", and A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1, entitled "The maintenance of international security — prevention of the violent disintegration of States".

I therefore request that the First Committee defer action on these two draft resolutions until tomorrow.

The Chairman: The delegation of New Zealand has requested postponement of action on draft resolutions A/C.1/51/L.22 and A/C.1/51/L.42/Rev.1. If I hear no objection I will postpone until tomorrow the taking of action on these two draft resolutions.

It was so decided.

The Chairman: The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.33. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.33, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region", was introduced by the representative of Algeria at the 14th meeting of the Committee, on 4 November 1996. In addition to the sponsors listed in the draft resolution, it is sponsored also by those which appear in document A/C.1/51/INF/3.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.33 have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.33 was adopted.

The Chairman: I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their positions.

Mr. Yativ (Israel): Israel joined the consensus on resolution A/C.1/51/L.33. However, my delegation wishes to state our position that all regional security matters pertaining to the Middle East are subject to the peace negotiations in our region. Paragraph 7 of the draft resolution does not take this into account.

Mr. Moradi (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation supports the basic thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.33 on the strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region. However, we would like to go on record with our reservation on the seventh preambular paragraph, on the Middle East peace process. The Islamic Republic of Iran has a principled position on the Middle East peace process and does not believe that the current process will lead to the fulfilment of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people or to the establishment of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the region.

The Chairman: I call on the representative of Sri Lanka on a point of order.

Mr. Goonetilleke (Sri Lanka): I have a question to ask of the Secretariat with regard to the fate of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/51/L.3. When will the Committee be in a position to take a decision on that draft resolution?

The Chairman: I call on the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs of the Secretariat.

Mr. Davinic (Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs): I must say that the delegation of Sri Lanka is not the only one that is making inquiries as to the state of affairs with regard to the various draft resolutions which are ready for action but cannot be taken up in the First Committee because a budget implication statement is still pending. As members know, this is not a matter on which the Centre for Disarmament Affairs has final authority. We depend on authorization from the budget office to read out the appropriate statements, and we are still waiting for that authorization. We have made it clear to our colleagues that the Committee is hampered in its work due to late approval of these statements, and we are receiving assurances that they are doing their utmost under strenuous conditions. Hopefully, most of these pending issues will be submitted to the Secretary of the Committee to be presented to the Committee tomorrow.

Mr. Goonetilleke (Sir Lanka): There was a specific reason for my asking that question. First, we have to bear in mind that the draft resolution was submitted on 29 October, and it is now 14 November. We recognize the problems faced by the Secretariat, and particularly by the budget office, but my problem is somewhat different: in paragraph 2, a request is made for summary records and other facilities for the NPT Review Conference and its Preparatory Committee. While we are waiting for the budget office to decide whether or not there are budgetary implications for the Organization, I understand that the Committee on Conferences is meeting informally, and it is not sure whether or not there will be a request for summary records for the Preparatory Committee meeting that is to be held next year.

So, unless we adopt this draft resolution as soon as possible, I believe that the Committee on Conferences will have its own difficulties. The least we can do, if it is possible, is to inform the Committee on Conferences that in paragraph 2 there is a request for summary records and other conference facilities. They could then take this request into consideration when they consider the matter.

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): I too want to refer to the fate of draft resolution A/C.1/51/L.3. The Russian Federation, like more than 180 other countries, is a sponsor of that draft

resolution, and we do not really understand why there should be such a delay in adopting it. We are very grateful to Mr. Davinic for his clarification, and we understand full well that he cannot be held responsible for the action, or lack of it, of the budget office. But I think it would be proper for us to receive, at the next meeting, some clarification about the complexities facing the budget office with regard to this draft resolution.

The Chairman: I call on the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs.

Mr. Davinic (Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs): I would like to assure all delegations that we will do our utmost to obtain approval from the budget office so that action can be taken tomorrow. Should we fail to obtain that approval for tomorrow, I will then ask a representative of the budget office to come before the Committee and explain the problem which is causing the delay in approval. I hope this meets with the Committee's acceptance.

The Chairman: Only two more meetings of the First Committee remain. However, we must still take action on the following draft resolutions: in cluster 1, A/C.1/51/L.3, L.27 and L.28/Rev.1; in cluster 2, A/C.1/51/L.48 and L.49; in cluster 5, A/C.1/51/L.15; in cluster 7, A/C.1/51/L.1/Rev.1 and L.11/Rev.1; in cluster 8, A/C.1/51/L.7; in cluster 9, A/C.1/51/L.38; and in cluster 10, A/C.1/51/L.22 and L.42/Rev.1. I should therefore like to ask the sponsors of those draft resolutions to be ready for the Committee to take action on them tomorrow.

Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to remind the Committee that, in accordance with the Committee's programme of work and timetable, on Monday, 25 November 1996, the Committee will embark on the last phase of its work — namely, general debate and consideration of and action on draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 62, entitled "Question of Antarctica". In this connection, I invite representatives of those delegations wishing to participate in the general debate on agenda item 62 kindly to place their names on the list of speakers as soon as possible.

I would also like to remind those delegations wishing to submit draft resolutions under agenda item 62 kindly to adhere to the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions as indicated in the Committee's programme of work and timetable, which is Monday, 18 November 1996, at 6 p.m.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.